

1  
2  
3  
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

6 \* \* \*

7 LAWRENCE MORELOCK,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 CHARMINE YAP, *et al.*,

11 Defendants.

Case No. 2:22-cv-01936-RFB-BNW

**ORDER**

12  
13 Before the Court for consideration is the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 52) of  
14 the Honorable Brenda Weksler, United States Magistrate Judge, entered June 13, 2023.

15 A district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or  
16 recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). A party may file specific  
17 written objections to the findings and recommendations of a magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. §  
18 636(b)(1); D. Nev. Civ. R. IB 3-2(a). When written objections have been filed, the district court  
19 is required to “make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified  
20 proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). See  
21 also D. Nev. Civ. R. IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, a district court is not  
22 required to conduct “any review,” *de novo* or otherwise, of the report and recommendations of a  
23 magistrate judge. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Pursuant to Local Rule IB 3-2(a),  
24 objections were due by June 27, 2023. No objections have been filed. The Court has reviewed  
25 the record in this case and concurs with the Magistrate Judge’s recommendations.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

**DATED:** February 1, 2024.

- 2 -